

REMARKS

Rejection under 35 USC section 112 par. 1

This rejection is respectfully traversed. Applicant respectfully submits that this claim reads on the specification at page 9, line 8 through page 10, line 2, as indicated in more detail in the table below.

What is done?	Where in spec?	Where in claim 4 (as retyped herein)?
The process 1-100 first processes object 110	p. 9, lines 10-11	Line 4
The process 1-100 queries the queue indicators	p. 9, lines 11-13	Lines 5-6
Processor 1-100 modifies queue indicators to obtain a modified object	p. 9, lines 14-20	Line 7
Processor 1-100 processes data object and places it in queue	Page 9, lines 22-page 10, line 2	Lines 8-9

Perhaps the Examiner is confused because the text of the specification indicates that the same data object has a new queue number, while the language of the claim says there is a second data object — but, technically, since the queue number has been changed it is no longer the same data object and can be considered a second data object; or, alternatively, a modified data object. The language of the claim is accordingly not inconsistent with the description in the specification. However, if the Examiner would allow a claim that said “modified data object” rather than “second data object,” Applicant would be willing to change the claim.

Nevertheless, new claim 8 is added, with a wording which the Examiner may find more straightforward. Applicant respectfully submits that claim 8 is not narrower than claim 4.

Rejection under 35 USC section 103

This rejection is respectfully traversed.

REMARKS

The claims all recite the use of “objects”. As would be clear to one of ordinary skill in the art, this refers to object oriented (O-O) programming. A background tutorial on object oriented programming is given in the specification at page 1, line 14 through page 5, line 12, where many definitions are given. The Examiner is particularly referred to page 2, lines 12-19 which gives details of the definition of an object.

Each object within an O-O system is defined by an interface and an implementation. A software client external to an object depends completely on its interface and not the details of its implementation. The implementation of an object provides the mechanisms and the details that define its behavior. O-O programs are collections of objects that relate to each other through their interfaces.

Enclosed is some information from an online dictionary website with more information about object-oriented programming, including many links showing this to be a very well-defined, known field.

The Examiner cites a reference in the field of cache/disk subsystems. This is an entirely different field. This reference is especially huge — 99 sheets of drawing and 188 columns of text — so one of ordinary skill in the art would not take tiny bits out of context and apply them to a different field.

Moreover, those parts of the reference pointed to by the Examiner do not appear to relate to the field of object-oriented programming at all, but rather to regular programming and hardware.

For instance, a queue identification table alone is not a path object. A table alone has an implementation that is apparent to the program using it. The program using it accesses the table, which is the implementation, directly. This is unlike an object that uses an interface to

REMARKS

communicate with other parts of a program. An object containing a table is not taught or suggested by a table alone. Also, a path alone does not teach or suggest a path object.

The various units — such as processors, storage units, and control units — that the Examiner points to appear to be hardware devices, not objects. Objects are software.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner has not made a *prima facie* case of obviousness against the claims.

The Examiner's other rejections and/or points of argument not addressed would appear to be moot in view of the foregoing. Nevertheless, Applicants reserve the right to respond to those rejections and arguments at a later date.

Please charge any fees other than the issue fee to deposit account 14-1270. Please credit any overpayments to the same account.

Applicant respectfully submits that he has answered each issue raised by the Examiner and that the application is accordingly in condition for allowance. Allowance is therefore respectfully requested.

<u>CERTIFICATE OF MAILING</u>	
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited this date with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to	
Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria VA 22313-1450	
On <u>10/15/03</u>	(date)
By <u>[Signature]</u>	(signature)

Respectfully submitted,

By [Signature]
Anne E. Barschall, Reg. No. 31,089
Tel. no. 914-332-1019
Fax no. 914-332-7719
October 14, 2003